

6. Please leave claim 8 unchanged;
7. Please cancel claim 9 without prejudice;
8. Please cancel claim 10 without prejudice; and
9. Please add new claims 18-30 as shown in the enclosed clean copy of the amended and new claims.

Remarks:

By this amendment, Applicant has incorporated various limitations from claims 2, 7, 9, and 10 into independent claim 1. New claims 18, 19, and 20 depend from claim 1 and are amply supported by the originally-filed specification. In particular, support for claim 18 can be found on page 17, line 12 and on page 18, line 21, support for claim 19 can be found on page 22, lines 19-21, and support for claim 20 can be found on page 15, line 25 through page 16, line 7. Further, new independent claim 21 includes several limitations from claim 1 and claim 6. Claim 21 and its dependent claims are also well-supported by the originally-filed specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims are allowable over the cited references for the reasons set forth below.

I. Amended claim 1 is patentable over the Komatsu/Atsumi/Igadoki/Horst/Haydon combination of references because the cited references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the recited relationship between Td and Trate and because the cited references further fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the recited limitation wherein the polar teeth stay within “a range of 220/N to 260/N degrees at central angle”.

Amended claim 1 now includes a limitations that were previously recited in claims 2, 7, 9, and 10. In responding to the Office Action, Applicant will explain the nonobviousness of amended claim 1 with respect to the references cited by the Office Action in rejecting these claims. In rejecting claim 7, the Office Action cites the Haydon reference in conjunction with the Komatsu/Atsumi/Igadoki combination to piece together the claimed invention, contending that the Haydon reference teaches the limitation relating to the polar teeth being within a range of 220/N to 260/N degrees at central angle. In rejecting claim 10, the Office Action cites the Horst reference in conjunction with the Komatsu/Atsumi/Igadoki combination to piece together the claimed invention, contending that the Horst reference teaches the recited relationship between Trate and Td. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is not rendered obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art by these references.